

## Amusements, etc., This Evening.

**ROOTH'S THEATRE.**—At 8 and at 8: "Daddy O'Wood." Mr. and Mrs. Dora Boudreau, and Miss Barry.

**GRAND OPERA HOUSE.**—At 8: "Uncle Sam." Mr. John Wood and John Brougham.

**NEW FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE.**—At 8: "New Year's Eve." New Opera House.

**NIBLO'S GARDEN.**—At 8 and at 8: "Leo and Loto." OLYMPIC THEATRE.

**OLYMPIC THEATRE.**—At 8 and at 8: "Humpty Dumpty." George L. Fox.

**UNION SQUARE THEATRE.**—At 8 and at 8: "Cousin Jack."

**WALLACK'S THEATRE.**—At 8 and at 8: "David Garrick." E. A. Sothern and Miss Katherine Rogers.

**AMERICAN INSTITUTE BUILDING.**—At 10 and at 7: "Barnum's World's Fair."

**ASSOCIATION HALL.**—At 8: Popular Matinée Reading. George Vandewater.

**SEVENTH REGIMENT ARMORY.**—Promenade Concert.

**SOMERVILLE ART GALLERY.**—Free Exhibition of Paintings.

**STERNWAY HALL.**—Concert. Theodore Thomas.

**TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE.**—Varieties.

**UNION LEAGUE THEATRE.**—At 8: Concert. Hampton Stearns.

## Business Notices.

**OFFICE OF FINE & HATCH.**  
No. 5 NASSAU ST., NEW YORK, March 19, 1873.

**The SIX PER CENT GOLD BONDS OF THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY,** being secured by a First Mortgage on a completed Road—which is one of the great East and West Trade Lines, commanding a large through business, and which, from the immense Mineral, Agricultural, and other valuable resources of the country it traverses, is assured of a very remunerative local traffic—are among the most substantial and satisfactory investments available in the market; and at the present price, 97½ and accrued interest, yield a liberal rate of interest on their cost.

They are in denominations of \$100, \$500, and \$1,000, coupon and registered; interest payable May and November; principal and interest in gold coin in New York.

We also buy and sell at current market rates, the WESTERN PACIFIC SIX PER CENT GOLD BONDS originally negotiated by us, and now quoted at the Stock Exchange, and widely known as favorite securities in the principal money markets. Coupon bonds of \$1,000; interest payable January and July; principal and interest payable in gold in New York. Price to-day, 94½ to 95.

We also buy and sell GOVERNMENT and CENTRAL PACIFIC BONDS, receive deposits, so which we allow interest, make collections, and do a general banking business.

FINE & HATCH.

**BRANDFORD & METZ** have removed their large stock of first-class Cabinet Furniture, Draperies, etc., from 125 Broadway to 129 New York and New York, 430 and 432 Broadway, where they will sell at current market rates, all their stock of first-class Furniture, Draperies, etc., at 430 and 432 Broadway.

**BATCHELOR'S HAIR DYE.** Best in the world. Safe, perfect, reliable. Has been used by all the great names of the hair-dyeing profession. All druggists.

**DR. R. FRANK PALMER—PATENT ARMS AND LOCKS.** 1,600 Cincinnati, Philadelphia, St. Louis, etc.

**ONLY COMPACT IN AMERICA** writing Yearly General Annuals. Published by the American Association of Authors, 1,600 Cincinnati, Philadelphia, St. Louis, etc.

**WEISS ON SHAKESPEARE.**—Six Shakespearian Studies, by Rev. John Weiss, reported in THE TRIBUNE LECTURES EXTRA No. 4, now ready. Price 30c by mail, 50c.

**THE TRIBUNE ALMANAC FOR 1873** is now ready. Price 20c each. Seven for \$1.

## TERMS OF THE TRIBUNE.

DAILY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$10 per annum. Single Copies, 5c. New York, 10c. Foreign, 15c. per annum. WEEKLY TRIBUNE, Mail Subscribers, \$2 per annum. Single Copies, 5c. New York, 10c. Foreign, 15c. per annum. ADVERTISING RATES. DAILY TRIBUNE, 30c, 40c, 50c, 60c, and \$1 per line. SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE, 25 and 50 cents per line. WEEKLY TRIBUNE, \$3, \$5, and \$5 per line. According to position in the paper. Terms, cash in advance. Address, THE TRIBUNE, New York. Advertisements received at up-town offices, 541 W. 23d-st., or 305 W. 23d-st., till 5 p. m., at regular rates.

**MEMORIAL OF HORACE GREELEY.**—The Tribune has just issued the Memorial Volume promised immediately after Mr. Greeley's death. Only the pamphlet copy is now ready, large 8vo, 265 pages, with portrait of Mr. Greeley, pictures of his birth-place, first school-house, home at Chappaqua, etc.; price 50 cents, sent free by mail on receipt of that sum. Another edition, handsomely bound, with additional portrait of Mr. Greeley, as he appeared in the last months of his life, will shortly be ready, price \$1.

## New-York Daily Tribune.

FOUNDED BY HORACE GREELEY.

SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1873.

## TRIPLE SHEET.

The report that Don Carlos has abdicated is denied. The city of San Salvador is said to have been destroyed by an earthquake. Edward Noyes was again examined in London for complicity in the Bank of England forgery.

Debate on the New York Charter has been postponed by the Senate to next Tuesday, and on the Brooklyn Charter by the Assembly to the same day. The Usury bill was defeated in the State Senate. A negro murderer was hanged in Kentucky, and another in Virginia.

A number of witnesses testified before the Erie Investigation Committee. No new facts were elicited at the Goodrich inquiry. The railroads are to take concerted action regarding the postal cars. A woman is supposed to have been killed to death by her husband. Gold, 116½, 116½, 116½. Thermometer, 32°, 40°, 32°.

The slight clew on which the police have stumbled in their investigation of the mysterious Brooklyn murder grows interesting. It may not lead anywhere, but it is something tangible for a beginning. Real detectives would make much of it. So far, it renews the century old question, Who was she?

In another column we print a careful study of political affairs in South Carolina as they now appear to a most capable and impartial observer, well known and long trusted by TRIBUNE readers. The picture is a sad one; it groups together the salient features of Southern civilization as it strikes a stranger. It gives us the view of a highly-civilized society overturned and a social chaos spread over the land. How much of this is retribution and how much purely accidental? Who shall say?

"All organisms from eggs" is the fundamental creed of modern natural history, and the subject of Prof. Agassiz's second lecture of the Museum course, elsewhere given with illustrations. Of the immense variety which is possible in eggs, despite their uniform characteristics, we get some glimpse in the broad field covered by the lecture. But that only the young of a given species is ever hatched from the egg of that species, is the one fact, the Professor thinks, to be held constantly in sight when studying theories, new or old, of the origin of life.

We present the Post-Office Department view of the postal car controversy in a letter printed on the third page of THE TRIBUNE. As here discussed, the question seems to be concluded, so far as the Department is concerned. There is no escape from the effect of the law of Congress which leaves the Postmaster-General neither discretion nor appeal. The rates of compensation are fixed, and the appropriations are made in accordance therewith. It is claimed that the General Government has

power to interfere. Let us see how the Post-Office Department can invoke that intervention.

There seems to be no getting away from the fact that the warehouse returns of the New-York Custom-house have been long and illegally withheld. THE TRIBUNE showed that no such returns had been received at Washington since those of December, 1871, received in February, 1873. The publication of this fact has hurried somebody, and, after much tribulation, an attempt to catch up has been made. The returns for the months of February, March, April, May, and June [were all] tumbled together into the Treasury Department. If there is a law compelling the filing of these returns within ten days of the end of each month, how does it happen that those of five months went in together without a law being broken?

Some of the developments before the Erie Investigating Committee, yesterday, were curiously interesting. Mr. Archer's fortunate contracts do not well bear the light of day; and Mr. Tweed's services and their compensation have a very unsavory look as now exhibited. That he had the handling of \$35,000 as a corruption fund to be used at Albany is made clear. Mr. Van Vechten, who delivers this peculiar information, is very sure this money was not to be used for "legislative purposes." But, then, he cannot or will not say what the money was spent for; and he recollects that Tweed was a member of the Legislature when it was paid out. Perhaps the Tweed investigation may give some clew to the mystery.

It is said that the Spring exodus of city dwellers to the country increases each year with a considerable ratio over previous migrations. That some of these emigrants to suburban towns return with the Autumn is certain; but many remain permanently away. So long as the problem of rapid transit in the City is unsolved, we must submit to this annual drain. Just what the railroads are doing to facilitate the increasing egress from New-York is shown by a tabulated statement printed on the fourth page of THE TRIBUNE, giving the rates of fare, commutations, daily number of trains, etc., on these roads.

On the third page of THE TRIBUNE to-day we print several letters of unusual interest from foreign correspondents. A second letter on the Irish question is chiefly occupied with a discussion of the various educational systems proposed for Ireland by English statesmanship. A Paris correspondent sketches the admirable speech of President Thiers on the bill of the Committee of Thirty, and no one can read the venerable statesman's summary of the material history of France since the war without a thrill of satisfaction that the young and liberal government has so well done so much. A Berlin letter reproduces some of the satirical observations which President Grant's second inaugural address has drawn from the German newspapers. It is pretty clear that our Teutonic friends are of but one opinion as to the propriety of the President's somewhat one-sided comparison of republican and monarchical institutions. They think that although Emperors may not be the best sort of rulers, they "know what belongs to good managers." As if our President did not!

We print the material portions of the replies of Commissioner Barkley and ex-Commissioner Wright to the charges of the State Treasurer as to the squandering of the canal funds. We have divested these replies of many expressions of personal feeling not essential to the argument, and we leave out details concerning the lateral canals from Mr. Wright's reply, since his views do not differ from those of Mr. Raines in regard to the uselessness of those dilapidated ditches. In the main, the replies set forth that the Canal Commissioners are not responsible for extravagance on the canals. They may be part of a bad system of financial machinery, but they are not the causes of its defects. "The appropriations are made by the Legislature; the work is ordered to be let by the Canal Board, and the Commissioners advertise and let the same 'pursuant to law.' The moral is that nobody but the Legislature, or the people who elect it, is responsible. The officers are merely clothed with executive powers. The Commissioner is not even, Mr. Wright thinks, responsible for a knowledge of the correctness of the Superintendent's estimates which he approves. He has to attend meetings. He has to prepare evidence against claims. And many other things. The poor man has a hard life of it. In fact, we don't see, if, as is claimed, the Commissioner is not responsible for anything except mere perfunctory work, how we are to accord Mr. Commissioner Barkley the credit which he claims for an expenditure of but little over half per year of the sum spent by his predecessors.

**THE QUARREL AT ALBANY.**  
Out of the angry debate and confusion at Albany we have at last the satisfaction of knowing that the Custom-house clique has measured its strength with what is popularly known as Mr. Thurlow Weed's "Old Guard," and has been badly beaten. It has been evident for some time to the wiser leaders of the party that Bliss and Murphy were dragging the Republican organization to its ruin. A Charter such as they forced through the Assembly would have buried the party under a load of odium in less than two years. It was so plainly a device for the personal emolument of a few individuals, and made a corrupt and inefficient municipal government so absolutely certain, that the whole city rebelled against it. The great struggle between the Custom-house faction and Mr. Weed's party took place in the caucus on Wednesday night. The first issue was the proposal of Senator Lowery that the decisions of the majority of the caucus should not control the action of Senators when the Charter came up for final disposition, and this point was carried in spite of the strenuous opposition of the followers of Murphy and Bliss. Then came the compromise plan, retaining in office Van Nor, Delafeld Smith, Henry Smith, and Col. Stebbins, and giving to the Mayor the appointment of the other heads of departments, subject to confirmation by the Aldermen. With the adoption of this scheme by the caucus, the overthrow of the clique was completed. They are going about the Capitol now, "washing their hands of the Charter," and vowing that they will leave the country to its fate if the whole patronage of the corporation is not placed in their hands. Beaten in the Senate, they are naturally losing their hold upon the Assembly also, and the thrifty patriots who are always

to be found on the winning side are making all possible haste to transfer their allegiance.

If it prove that the defeat of the Murphy Ring is a permanent discomfiture, and not a mere momentary check, the astute managers by whom this result has been accomplished will deserve the hearty thanks of all friends of good government. For the present at any rate the way seems to be open for the victors to give us what they please; and if they have wisdom enough to present an instrument really adapted to the wants of the city and acceptable to the tax-payers, they will insure their own supremacy in the Republican party. Thus far the amendments to the Charter, though they destroy some of the most objectionable features of the original Custom-house plan, fall far short of what New-York demands. A responsible government is not secured by taking away from the Mayor the appointment of four of the principal executive officers of the city; and although to some of the four who are specially retained no particular personal objection is known, the fact that they are kept in office for strictly partisan reasons discredits the whole scheme of legislation in which their retention forms so prominent a part. Mr. George M. Van Nort has the disposal of more small patronage than any other official of the corporation, and he is kept because he can make votes. Mr. Henry Smith, commonly called "Hank," was abused by the Administration Republicans straight through the Fall campaign as a creature of Tweed and a thoroughly corrupt man; but he has made his peace and been taken into favor, and he must be retained to manipulate the police at the next election. Mr. Stebbins is a gentleman of excellent character, but it is not on that account that he is kept in office; as Park Commissioner he can distribute appointments where they will do most good, and he too will be useful at election time. The importance of owning the District-Attorney is so well understood from the history of the Tweed administration that it is unnecessary to explain it. On the other hand, Mr. Green, a faithful Controller, who has saved the city hundreds of thousands of dollars, who cannot be corrupted and cannot be used by a political clique, is roughly discarded, because he will not be a tool at election time and will not shut his eyes to any financial irregularities.

For a few days the rival factions will be mustering their forces at Albany and preparing for the final battle. The Senate is not yet in the mood of giving us a really non-partisan Charter, and one of the two cliques whose initial skirmish we have just witnessed will probably get the mastery over us. Between the two our preferences are very decided. But before the question is finally settled let us state once more what the tax-payers require, and what sooner or later they will get, if the right of the people to manage their own affairs is to be recognized:

1. A separation of municipal government from all partisan complications, by holding city elections in the Spring.
2. The concentration of responsibility in the hands of the Mayor, who shall have full powers of appointment and removal untrammelled by the Aldermen.
3. Frequent elections, by which the Mayor can be held strictly accountable to the people for a faithful performance of his duties.

—Give us something of this kind, and if the people are capable of governing themselves we shall soon have a respectable administration. If they are not, we shall have—just what we desire.

## WELLS AND WOOL.

For the thirty-two years of its life the invariable habit of THE TRIBUNE has been to accord a fair hearing to either side of any important question in dispute. On no one subject have THE TRIBUNE's own views been more distinct and uncompromising than on that of the Tariff, and particularly of the Tariff on Wool and Woollens. But we have unhesitatingly allowed Messrs. Atkinson, Edward Harris, John Stuart Mill, and others to present in these pages the strongest arguments they could advance against Protection; and to-day, consistently adhering to our traditional policy, we give ample space to the ablest of our American Free Trade apostles. A few weeks ago, the Hon. J. Wiley Edmunds made to one of our reporters some expressions of his belief as to the workings of the Tariff on the development of our Wool and Woollen industries. These informal and hasty conversational expressions Mr. David A. Wells seizes upon as a text for a most elaborate and carefully considered argument. To some features of it we shall, this morning, pay very brief attention.

One of our most courteous and able contemporaries, *The World*, lately expressed some surprise at the appearance of Mr. Edmunds's views in THE TRIBUNE, and treated it as the only intimation since the Cincinnati Convention that THE TRIBUNE adhered to the faith of its Founder, in Protection to American Industry. *The World* should not have misunderstood its own defeat at Cincinnati. The one thing which Mr. Greeley then demanded—the thing for which he specially sent a personal representative to the Convention, and on which he steadfastly insisted, down till the hour when his triumph, alike in the Committee and the Convention, was assured—was that nothing should be done to compromise the most devoted Protectionists, in their cooperation in the work of Reform with the Free Traders, whom Mr. Wells of the East and Col. Grosvenor and Mr. Horace White of the West so well represented in the Cincinnati movement. No man knows better than Mr. David A. Wells that, on the question of Protection, Mr. Greeley was inexorable;—that the Free Traders fought him at Cincinnati, at every point, and at every point were foiled;—and that finally they accepted, and, through the mouth of Mr. Edward Atkinson, enthusiastically praised the very proposition which Mr. Greeley had from the outset demanded. They do most grossly slander him who intimate that for one moment he ever wavered in his devotion to those doctrines of Political Economy of which he was the most distinguished expounder; and which to-day, largely through his influence, stand, as they are long likely to stand, the faith and practice of the American people. They equally slander the Journal he created who intimate that it has wavered, or is likely to waver, in its devotion to the same distinctively American principles. We have not, indeed, thought it necessary to be perpetually discussing them out of season. They have triumphed;—for many a year to come they are settled. It is quite beyond the power of Mr. Wells and his little knot of accomplished agitators to unsettle them. When they become practical questions again, THE TRIBUNE will have its say;—till then it contents itself with according to so capable an advocate as

Mr. Wells the freest hearing and the briefest rejoinder.

The matter at issue is mainly one of fact, and can be easily decided. However unreasonable it may be to measure the value of an industrial policy by a six years' trial, as Mr. Wells proposes, the condition of the wool industry within that time has, on the whole, been so satisfactory as amply to vindicate the wisdom of affording it protection. During the period of comparative free trade in wool, extending from 1840 to 1860 (excepting 1842-47), the number of sheep in the United States increased only 14 per cent, so that the wool clip of 1860 was at most only 17 per cent greater than it was 20 years before. The Protectionist policy adopted in 1861 changed this state of things. Stimulated by the direct and indirect encouragement afforded by the tariff of 1861 and 1867, the production of wool increased rapidly, so that according to Mr. James Lynch, a leading authority, the wool clip and imports of several years were as follows:

|      | Wool clip. | Imports.  |
|------|------------|-----------|
| 1860 | 10,000,000 | 4,400,000 |
| 1861 | 10,000,000 | 7,400,000 |
| 1862 | 10,000,000 | 4,500,000 |
| 1863 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 1864 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 1865 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 1866 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 1867 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 1868 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 1869 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 1870 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 1871 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| 1872 | 10,000,000 | 5,000,000 |

The census of 1860 returns the wool product of 1859-60 at 99,675,362 pounds; and we accept Mr. Lynch's estimate of 106,000,000 for that as well as other years. The wool clip represents the aggregate quantity received from abroad in Boston, New-York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore in each calendar year named.

These figures amply redeem the promise that "sheep husbandry will increase," for they show that during a period wherein the country was involved in war, and our markets were flooded with cheap foreign wool, sheep husbandry increased so rapidly that while in 1860 we raised 106,000,000 pounds of wool, and imported about 4,400,000 pounds, in 1870 we raised 163,000,000 pounds and imported 28,559,298 pounds. The progress which this comparison displays in itself, amply attests the good effects of defensive duties. But it must also be taken into account that the tariff of 1867 was passed during a time of great depression in the wool industry, and that it saved us from a reaction which would have been felt for years, and would have resulted in making the country mainly dependent on foreign supplies for an article of vital necessity to the comfort and prosperity of the people.

The assurance that sheep husbandry would be rendered "remunerative" has also been realized. The American farmer has, during the last ten years, received on the average a better price for his wool than was paid elsewhere, and instead of being compelled, like the Australian and South American, to abide by the prices of the London sales, he enjoys the advantages resulting from a home market, and of being able in several instances in the West to exchange his raw material for finished fabrics, thus saving the cost of freight and commission.

As regards woollen manufactures, the results of Protection are likewise gratifying. The value of the woollen goods produced in the United States in 1860 was \$98,000,000; in 1867, it had increased to \$178,000,000; and, according to the census of 1870, it was \$153,495,053, distributed as follows:

|               |            |                |             |
|---------------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| Alabama       | \$8,998    | Missouri       | \$1,256,213 |
| Arkansas      | 75,200     | New Hampshire  | 13,500,104  |
| California    | 1,102,754  | New Jersey     | 1,300,225   |
| Connecticut   | 17,371,043 | New York       | 14,304,786  |
| Delaware      | 516,067    | North Carolina | 238,638     |
| Florida       | 280        | Ohio           | 3,287,090   |
| Georgia       | 471,523    | Oregon         | 506,857     |
| Illinois      | 2,849,249  | Pennsylvania   | 2,750,586   |
| Indiana       | 4,272,711  | Rhode Island   | 12,534,117  |
| Iowa          | 1,647,676  | South Carolina | 34,459      |
| Kansas        | 151,150    | Tennessee      | 676,544     |
| Kentucky      | 1,312,458  | Vermont        | 13,500,104  |
| Louisiana     | 30,795     | Vermont        | 3,619,453   |
| Maine         | 6,298,881  | Virginia       | 485,452     |
| Maryland      | 127,296    | West Virginia  | 1,250,703   |
| Massachusetts | 39,502,582 | Wisconsin      | 1,250,703   |
| Michigan      | 1,294,985  | New Mexico     | 31,000      |
| Minnesota     | 219,562    | Utah           | 199,609     |
| Mississippi   | 147,321    |                |             |

Comparing the state of things in 1860 with that indicated by the census and official returns of 1870, it appears that while in the former year we manufactured woollen goods valued at \$68,000,000, and imported more, worth \$38,328,429, in 1870 the value of woollen fabrics made in American factories had increased to \$153,495,053, while our imports were only \$34,000,000, or nearly \$4,000,000 less than we bought in 1860, when home and foreign woollens, worth \$102,000,000, sufficed for the year's demand. The progress which these figures indicate will satisfy every reasonable mind of the superior merits of a policy which within a decade nearly trebled the production attained after fourteen years of Free Trade.

In view of these figures, the alleged depression in the clothing branch of woollen manufactures cannot be deemed so serious as to warrant a change in our national policy—especially as the leading houses in this city attribute the present dullness almost entirely to over-production. The cause, it is evident, will in any business entail heavy losses. If a man needs only five yards of cloth, you can hardly induce him to buy five more on any terms, and the same is true in large transactions. Miscalculating the extent of the home consumption, manufacturers have continued making woollens, and find they cannot obtain the prices which ruled when there was a smaller stock on hand. *The U. S. Economist*, a Free Trade authority cited by Mr. Wells, confirms this view of the matter in these words:

From the beginning of the year 1872 to its close, our constant efforts were to induce a curtailment of production by any method possible. Manufacturers by their actions chose a different path, and endeavored to cheapen the cost of production by an increased production rather than enhance the price of goods by reducing the supply. With the production of goods, as of American goods, many mills, however, shut down, as to continue to run at the prevailing prices for goods would be suicidal in the extreme. By this action, though taken late in the day, we find about 300 sets of machinery idle, yet notwithstanding this curtailment of production, and the large destruction at the Boston fire, heavy goods can be purchased to-day at a less price than for many years.

Instead, therefore, of heeding those who make the tariff responsible for dull trade with the view of removing all protection, it behooves our manufacturers to maintain firmly the compact made with the wool-growers in 1867, which the latter, the more numerous and influential class, are resolved to uphold. If relief be needed when Congress assembles, that body is more likely to advance the duty on cloths, &c., than reduce that on wools. It is doubtful, however, if any changes will be required, for the cost of production is increasing so rapidly in England as to render their woollen manufacturers less able to compete with us than heretofore. Just consider the following from *The London Economist* of the 8th inst.:

**LEADS.**—The woollen market has been of the quietest. In consequence of the dearth of cloths, the wools mills hereabouts are thrown into a greater extent than was at first imagined. Under the circumstances, cloths are at their wits' end. As the season is fast drawing to a close, many mills have to complete orders immediately, and all submit to heavy pecuniary loss. Wool and all other materials are slow of sale and firm in price.

**ROCHDALE.**—Some orders for fancy flannels are being placed, and there is some inquiry for plain goods, but

everything is so dear that no more business, either speculative or immediate, is done that can be avoided. There is very little done in the way of forced sales, and this shows that the trade is generally sound. Stocks of wool are small and prices firm.

—Consumers will not fail to observe—although Mr. Wells takes care not to concede it—that, owing to the depression of which he writes, woollen goods are now as cheap as in 1869, and some much cheaper, although abroad prices have advanced, the cost of coal having increased 75 per cent and iron and steel fully one-third.

—In 1869, Mr. Greeley arrived at the following conclusions, based upon unquestionable facts, mainly drawn from official returns. In spite of the partial depression which exists, the statement is as true of the wool industry now as when the veteran Protectionist made it:

These, then, are the results already realized from the Protection afforded to our wool and woollen industry by the increased duties imposed by the tariffs of 1861-67 inclusive:

I. A very considerable increase of our annual production of wool, and a much larger extension of our woollen manufactures.

II. A consequent and important increase in the amount paid for labor employed in our woollen industry, in good part to women and children, whose earnings and acquired skill are substantially so much added to our national wealth.

III. A very decided improvement in the quality and finish of our woollen fabrics, especially shawls, cassimere, beaver cloths, and other descriptions intended to be worn as outer garments; and, as a result, the cost of our woollen goods, secured without cost to our consumers; since the average prices of substantial, serviceable woollen fabrics are actually cheaper (in gold) to-day than they were ten years ago.

Free Trade failed to secure such results prior to 1860, and unless Mr. Wells can prove that it would have acted differently from 1860 to 1870, he cannot expect the country to adopt a policy which has already been amply "tried and found wanting."

## A SATURDAY SERMON.

It is hardly our province to add to the sermons which the Lenten season calls out. But if politics are banished from the pulpit and religion from secular newspapers, where is the relationship between them to be made good? How can two be agreed unless they sometimes walk together? Or will our readers tell us there is and ought to be no kinship between them? That is the creed upon which the great mass of our religious population act. Our neighbor Johnston is not only an honest but a devout man. He brings up his children in the fear and admonition of the Lord. He carries the principles of justice, which the Savior taught, into his minutest dealings with his customers, and his mercy into every dole or kindly word he gives to the poor. Into his share of social life, and study of science or literature, even into his recreation, he takes these great truths, and orders his beliefs and actions by them. But the moment he approaches his duty as a citizen, Christian principles are thrown aside as effete and impracticable. Either he votes or engineers his party tactics according to the expediency of the present moment, or else he washes his hands of the whole unclean business. He will sit by the hour bemoaning that "politics are hopelessly corrupt;" that the City, State, or National Government is in the hands of men ready and willing to be bought to favor any iniquitous scheme of peculation; that the elections in the cities are carried by fraud, and are virtually controlled by the basest class of politicians and the element of ruffianism which they bring to bear on the ballot-box. Yet he and thousands of his like decline to interfere. They are content to sit tranquilly groaning, day after day, over their newspaper and the depravity of their fellow men. Sheer indolence is the motive power with most of them in their inaction. They dread the shame, the bruit of unearthing corruption. "Sir not 'up muddy water,' is their favorite maxim. But with many the deterrent cause is the weight of an office held by themselves or their friends. Who ever knew the holder of an office turn against the party which had given it to him, however corrupt? Why should we oust any bribe-taker or heap reproach on him, when he 'spoke a kind word to get Bill 'in the Custom-house,' or to 'send Dave as 'Consul to the South Seas'?" Honesty has weight in public men, doubtless, yet our own bread and butter on the other scale make it kick the beam.

This sort of reasoning may do for the poor mortals who profess no religion. But is it sufficient for those who ostensibly follow the example of Him whose actions will to-morrow be expounded in countless pulpits throughout the land? Now if Christianity means anything at all, it means honesty. It means clean hands. It means fearlessness in duty. And if a Christian owes any duty to his neighbor, it is that he shall choose men to make the laws, and execute them, who have at least not been branded as thieves, liars, and perjurers. It is that he shall use what little strength and influence he has to keep our elections from becoming an exhibition of the power of the most brutal mobocracy; our judiciary clear of at least open bribery, and Congress free from such disclosures as those of the last two months. The devout man who keeps himself aloof from politics and politicians, inwardly thanking God he is not as these men, is in his place clearly derelict in duty.

Eighteen hundred years ago this very question was tried before the Jewish public. Their suffrages were asked, as now, whether to choose as their ruler the embodiment of Justice, Honesty, and the highest law of Humanity, or to sacrifice Him for a man publicly branded as a felon. Jesus, as King of the Jews, would have been just as inconvenient, as antagonistic to old precedents and old prejudices, as Jesus controlling in spirit our ballot-boxes, our courts, or Congress. The Jew had his office to lose, his warm little income to sacrifice, before he could subscribe to the faith of a teacher who bade him sell all that he had, and give to the poor. Consequently he preferred that matters should continue comfortably as they were. Let Jesus be crucified out of the way, and Barabbas, whose habits had grown into one of the institutions of the country, be released. Now, as then, the old question is asked, "Will you have this Man to rule over you?" And we, like the Jews, reply, "Not this man, but Barabbas." What does it matter to us that "Barabbas is a robber?"

Ex-Senator Alex. C. Cattell of New-Jersey, who has been designated as the confidential agent of the Treasury Department to superintend the funding of the \$300,000,000 loan to the Syndicate last Winter, will soon sail for Europe. Mr. Cattell has been for many years a careful student of national finance and is a gentleman of noticeable energy and industry, combined with a cheerful and pleasant address. We hope that he may prove a worthy and successful representative of his country in superintending the details of this important negotiation.

## TOPICS OF THE TIME.

## NEW VIEWS OF THE SALARY STEAL.

Many thoughtful people believe that one reason for the rapid deterioration of Congress, and indeed of the character of the men whom we are able to attract to public life generally, has been the inadequacy of the salaries. First-class abilities, such as we ought to demand in our Congressmen, have long been commanded in private business much higher salaries than the public were willing to pay. On the other hand, has been from the beginning equally apparent that, save in exceptional cases, no amount of salary would secure first-class men for the places, many of the constituencies having a decided preference for the cheaper kind they generally send.

But at any rate the question of the increase of salaries was clearly one to which there were two sides. There were no sides to the Credit Mobilier corruption and perjury. Under the circumstances nothing could have been more ludicrous than the zeal with which the more hide-bound of the party papers have leaped at the opportunity to condemn something. They have kept quiet during the Credit Mobilier business only to flame forth in inextinguishable wrath against the wretched Congressmen who voted for increased salaries. And the fury of their performance has been such as to lead to a natural feeling of disgust among a great many sensible people. Still it is true that the clause making the increase of salaries apply to the old Congressmen themselves was essentially a dishonest ploy. *The Nation* puts this point very clearly.

No man thinks that any Congress has done for many years as exact as much public indignation as the vote of the "honest" pay to themselves by the members of the XIXth Congress. The clause which made the amount of most of them will of course be a subject of shield hereafter, and will enable them to enjoy the money in peace. But the offense, dirty little if it all, of that part of a Congress which should raise its own salary in the middle of its year, pay itself out of the till, and then resign, and set the directors at defiance, in fact, is a crime which should be punished, and would know that he might be reached by the law, while Congressmen know they are safe against any punishment of criminal justice. One of the most striking results of the caucus system is that it has given us a class of "statesmen" on whom the opinion of the decent and moral elements of American society has absolutely no influence, and who revel in an unprecedented callousness. It is just possible, however, that a good many, if not all, of the millionaires who voted against the bill consider that they have thus discharged their obligations to virtue, and that they may now pocket the money along with the barometer. The trust companies and the neighbors of returned legislators will make them understand that it is as disgraceful to take the money as to vote for it. Congress is not without illustrious precedent for its performance, to be sure; but, on the other hand, neither are the people without historical precedents for their indignation, and their punishment of